

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/182,842 10/29/98 BEHL

S 033129-001

MMC1/1227

EXAMINER

KEVIN H FORTIN  
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS LLP  
333 TWIN DOLPHIN DRIVE  
SUITE 700  
REDWOOD SHORES CA 94065-1418

ABRAMS, N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED:

12/27/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/182842	Applicant(s)
Examiner	Abrams	Group Art Unit 2839

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

### Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

### Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10-31-00 (RE and prelim amdt)

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13, 14 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13, 14 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

### Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

The request for an RCE is acknowledged. A first action in such RCE follows. Last amendment is ~~entered, but is noted to be improper~~; all lines in claims must be at double or one and a half spacing. If any of claims 1, 7 or 13 are to be amended, they should be rewritten with proper line spacing.

Abstract, a sentence noting use of two guides (68,70) for a PCMCIA card and a flash card should be added.

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Drawings as amended and spec. Are objected to as follows.

Fig. 1, lead line 20 should be to the plug. Numbered 34 (page 3, line 22) is not seen in fig 2; numeral 44 (the lock) is not seen. Page 4, lines 14-17 refer to a "front 52" but in fig 2 "52" represents the rails.

Fig 2 is objected to, two slots 68, 70 but only a single card 60 is shown. Both cards should be shown accorded numerals and referred to in the spec.

Fig. 3, the socket in part 62 should be given a numeral (68 if that is correct) and the second socket should also be shown in the figure. Fig. 2 should be revised to clearly show the two slots at least in part.

Numerical 60 (fig 2) is not found in the spec.

Claim 1 while proper could be amended to more clearly define "use of plural card slots for receiving plural PC cards" ~~if~~ that is the intended limitation.

Art Unit: 2839

Claim 1, 3-11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai in view of Shieh, Darden, Cheng, Heung, Lwee Klatt, Klein and admitted prior art..

Obvious to form the Tsai assembly 1 to be insertable along rails into a docking assembly of the type shown in Darden or admitted prior art, fig. 1.

Also obvious to add a fan in view of Cheng, Heung and Klein.

In addition, for claims 1, 4-6, as broadly recited a single slot as in Tsai or Shieh is adequate. Should issues arise also obvious to form the carrier with plural slots for plural PC cards in view of Lwee figs 2,3 and Klatt. For claim 14, obvious to use a lock in view of Darden.

Claims 1, ~~3~~-11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Darden, Tsai, Cheng, Hueng, Lwee, Klatt and Klein.

It would have been obvious to form the prior art, fig. 1 carrier with a slot or slots for receiving cards in view of Tsai at fig. 2 at 1223 and 5 and Shieh at 9. Also obvious to form the carrier with plural slots for PC cards in view of Lwee and Klatt. For claim 1, it also is submitted that a single slot receiver would be adequate.

Also obvious to add a fan in view of Cheng, Klein and Heung.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Darden and admitted prior art.

Note Cheng power connector 21 and fan 25. Obvious to use the Cheng carrier 20 with a docking assembly with rails like 100 of Darden or 14 of prior art, fig. 1.

Art Unit: 2839

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

Abrams/tr

12-18-00

*Neil Abrams*  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322